UNOFFICIAL DRAFT MEETING MINUTES (No Quorum)
CONTINUUM OF CARE COMMITTEE MEETING
Tuesday, October 11, 2016, 10:30 AM
Location: The Iowa Finance Authority
Address: 2015 Grand Avenue, Des Moines, Iowa 50312

A meeting of the Continuum of Care Committee was held on October 11, 2016. The following voting members were present: Zeb Beilke-McCallum, Steven Benne, Scott Mather, and Tim Wilson (Co-Chair). A quorum was <u>not</u> established.

I.   Introductions
Tim Wilson led the introduction of committee members and non-committee members both in person and on the phone conference line. After discussion it was decided IFA would start sending out a recurring meeting request to committee members for the second Tuesday of every month. An exception to that is that the November meeting will be held the third Tuesday, Nov. 15th due to Election Day on the 8th.

II.   Approval of Agenda
No quorum – approval of Agenda deferred until next meeting.

III.   Approval of Minutes
No quorum – approval of Minutes deferred until next meeting.

IV.   Discussion and Review of Project Site Visits
Discussion led by Tim Wilson.
A. <u>Lessons to apply to next year</u>
B. **<u>Plan for use of notes</u>** – No plan yet for a collection of notes at site visits. Several members have submitted notes. Tim doesn't want committee members to recreate notes if not already done, but is requesting they submit them if available. At a minimum they will be useful for next year's site visit.
C. <u>Preparing report for November ICH meeting</u> - Elements of this year's visits to be shared with the Council at the November ICH meeting; recurring themes or issues that need to be discussed. Decisions to be made about best way to present, group or focus on common issues. Deadline of Oct. 28th to get notes submitted in order to compile prior to next CoC meeting on Nov. 15th. This is for those site visits that have already taken place. Tim Wilson to notify committee members of this date. Suggestion that agencies also be contacted for any information they might want to contribute. Goal is for notes to serve as baseline to give structure to next year's visits. Plan to get typed up notes together for a presentation at the November 15th ICH meeting

V.   Review Application Scoring Process
A. <u>Renewal projects</u> – bigger process than the new application review due to about 21 "Renewals" versus 12 "New Applications". Amber Lewis raised the issue of the overall scoring process approach. Is it best to continue to do so before HUD opens the competition? This is how it has been done the last two years. Timetable is always going to be somewhat at the mercy of HUD's timetable and the Consolidated Application.

B. <u>New projects</u> – More differential on scoring new projects. One question was thrown out on the renewal scoring. There was less differential on the scoring of the renewal projects, which makes it more difficult. This was to be expected since renewal project applicants have more experience.

C. <u>Pros/cons of combining</u> – there was good mix of people on the review committee. We were able to get four reviewers for every application.

Discussion on the possibility of moving to a scoring method using strictly objective questions versus qualitative approach (no essay type answers). This may result in helping to ensure that the available money applied based on the scoring ranking is more objective. This would be a very different approach to ranking than we've taken in the past. This approach of moving strictly to objective scoring was discussed at the National Alliance Conference in July. Amber Lewis pointed out that rather than just using the annual APR reports from HUD's system we would need both the HMIS report and the APR numbers to get closer to verifiability. Zeb Beilke-McCallum stressed this approach would take away the qualitative questions and just use such things as verifiable numbers, percentages, vacancy rates and costs according to the applicant's APR. It was suggested that it would be helpful to have examples to see this method and Zeb Beilke-McCallum offered to provide examples from the National Alliance Conference to CoC Committee members. Chair Tim Wilson pointed out that he would not want to lose recognizing participation in the Coordinated Entry process. Zeb Beilke-McCallum was able to pull up an "AP" on his phone to provide some examples of program criteria benchmarks and how they were used in applying points. There was discussion that if this is based on information entered into HMIS there will need to be an alternative plan for DV agencies. There was discussion that just looking at geography can be misleading if it only serves a certain population, or type, of client. It was stressed that we need to identify "needs", not just geographic location to help quantify where additional funds from new sources could be applied.

Mariliegh Fisher commented that she believes the current application process is skewed because applicants are not scored based on their own merits but are judge based on other applicants. Also seemed unfair to her that a "Transitional Housing" project was able to renew as a "Rapid Rehousing" program when HUD had not approved that yet. Also concerns that there was not discussion after "Appeals Process". Chair Tim Wilson noted that this more objective approach would eliminate additional narrative in scoring.

Amber Lewis suggested the possibility of putting together a "tool" soon (within the next couple months) and get agencies to plug in data to see where they stand and possibly make corrections before the next competition. Discussion on the possibility of getting this done by the end of the calendar year to see how this new method works before making the decision to proceed this way.

Zeb Beilke-McCallum stressed the importance of this approach in assisting in the CoC process and our ability to get federal homeless dollars. Chair Wilson pointed out that we obviously need more information and to get the information and a model out to agencies affected; the possibility of getting an outline of a plan out to get comments from grantees prior to developing a tangible plan. Amber Lewis mentioned that it would be huge to get this

done but would certainly move the CoC forward; a lot of work in the next couple months, but resulting in a lot less work next summer. This would help to make the site visits more productive to have this information available.

D. <u>Appeals process</u> – Chair Wilson pointed out this new method would assist in streamlining the appeals process. Important that there are "benchmarks" and not expectation of 100%.

VI.   <u>Discussion about making 2017 application electronic</u>

Chair Tim Wilson started discussion of going on-line, the process of checking a form and only having a range of answers. Different role for reviewers, more of an administrative task. Amber Lewis pointed out the ESG/SAF applicant is electronic but very different because still objective. Mariliegh Fisher commented that this would eliminate a lot of excess attachments, or at least limit them. It was agreed that this ends up being a simpler process.

VII.   <u>Discussion of possible roles for co-chairs</u>

Chair Tim Wilson discussed the amount of work involved in the coordination of the site visit process. It would be a great relief to have a co-chair role to manage some of these tasks. We were perhaps too accommodating to agencies for scheduling the site visits and need to present more limited options. Amber Lewis suggested the possibility of an on-line tool to assist with scheduling.

VIII.   <u>New Business</u>

 Amber Lewis: SOAR Training - almost all applicants had to answer "No" in application because HUD Project Application requires within the last 2 years. This may also affect the Consolidated Application. Discussion that the training (on-line) is very intense, taking approximately 20 hours, or more, and that it might not be worthwhile if an agency is not going to use SOAR. More applicable for agencies providing Permanent Supportive Housing programs.

IX.   <u>Old Business</u> - None

X.   <u>Public Comments</u> - None

IV.   <u>**Next meeting date:**</u> November 15, 2016 10:30 a.m.

V.   <u>Adjourn</u>
No quorum – no motion to adjourn

Voting Committee Members Present
1. Zeb Beilke-McCallum, Iowa Coalition Against Domestic Violence
2. Steve Benne, Iowa Economic Development Authority
3. Scott Mather, Iowa Workforce Development (phone)
4. Tim Wilson (Co-Chair, CoC Committee), Home Forward Iowa

Non-Committee Members
1. Mariliegh Fisher, Community Housing Initiatives (phone)
2. David Hagen, Hawkeye Area Community Action Program (phone)
3. Amber Lewis – Iowa Finance Authority
4. Carole Vipond – Iowa Finance Authority